



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/653,305	09/02/2003	William N. Schilit	FXPL-01018US0	2768
23910	7590	03/10/2008	EXAMINER	
FLIESLER MEYER LLP 650 CALIFORNIA STREET 14TH FLOOR SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94108			KT, PENG	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	2174		
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE			
03/10/2008	PAPER			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/653,305	Applicant(s) SCHILIT ET AL.
	Examiner SIMON KE	Art Unit 2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 November 2007.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 16-25 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 16-25 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/0256/06)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 11/28/07 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

This action is responsive to communications: Amendment, filed on 11/28/07.

Claims 16-25 are pending in this application. Claim 16 is independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 16-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lincke et al. ("Lincke" US Patent No. 6,397,259) in view of Kanevsky ("Kanevsky" US Patent No. 6,300,947).

Regarding independent claim 16, Lincke teaches a method for formatting Web page information for providing to a display, on a mobile device comprising the steps of: initiating access to a Web page data file identified by a URL, access imitated by a user selection of the URL from the mobile device (i.e. compare "HTML Page 144" on Neb Server 140" with "Browser 104" on "Wireless Application 106" in Figure 1 et seq. of Lincke). Lincke does not teach a web page containing links, or extracting and providing links for viewing.

Kanevsky teaches a web page containing both content and links, extracting the links from the content of the Web page, said extracting performed without receiving further input from a

user, and providing the links separately from the content for viewing on the display (i.e. extraction and display of links in FIG. 7. of Kanevsky).

It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine the extraction and display of links of Kanevsky into the formatting of web pages for mobile devices of Lincke. Said artisan would be motivated to combine Kanevsky into Lincke to provide a means by which the user can more conveniently access web page information in smaller electronic devices by filtering and organizing content based on information such as links, allowing the user to view topics and links as desired (i.e. see col. 2 line 1-20 of Kanevsky).

Regarding dependent claim 17, Lincke in combination with Kanevsky teaches the method of claim 16, wherein the step of providing the links separately from the content comprises the steps of determining if more than one of the links identifies a single destination, and if so providing only one of the links identifying the single destination to the display (see Kanevsky, col. 10, lines 35-50).

Regarding dependent claim 18, Lincke in combination with Kanevsky teaches the method of claim 16, wherein the step of providing the links separately from the content comprises the steps of: defining names for links identified by text in the Web page using at least a portion of the identifying text; and defining names for links identified by a non- text image in the Web page by using at least a portion of text in an alternative (ALT) tag for the image if text is provided in an ALT tag associated with the image (i.e. see col. 61line 25 et seq. for table and analysis of use of ALT tag to replace text, compare use in

Figure 1 et seq. of Lincke and see Kanevsky, col. 10, lines 35-50).

Regarding dependent claim 19, Lincke in combination with Kanevsky teaches the method of claim 18, further comprising the step of defining names for links identified by non-text images in the Web page by using at least a portion of a URL code for the link when no text is provided in the ALT tag for the image (i.e. see col. 61 line 25 et seq. for table and analysis of use of ALT tag to replace text, compare use in Figure 1 et seq. of Lincke and see Kanevsky, col. 10, lines 35-50).

Regarding dependent claim 20, Lincke in combination with Kanevsky teaches the method of claim 18, further comprising the step of defining names for links identified by non-text images in the Web page by using content of documents accessed using the links when no text is provided in the ALT tag for the image (i.e. see col. 61 line 25 et seq. for table and analysis of use of ALT tag to replace text, compare use in Figure 1 et seq. of Lincke and see Kanevsky, col. 10, lines 35-50).

Regarding dependent claim 21, Lincke in combination with Kanesky teaches the method of claim 20, wherein the content of the documents accessed using the link are titles see Kanevsky, col. 10, lines 35-50; see similar extraction and presentation in Figure .1 et seq. of Lincke).

Regarding dependent claim 22, Lincke in combination with Kanesky teaches the method of claim 18, further comprising the step of defining names for links identified by non-text images in the Web page by using identifications for the links obtained from offsite documents when no text is provided in the ALT tag for the image (i.e. see col. 61 line 25 et seq. for table and analysis of use of ALT tag to replace text, compare use in Figure 1 et seq. of Lincke and see Kanevsky, col. 10, lines 35-50).

Regarding dependent claim 23, Lincke in combination with Kanesky teaches the method of claim 16, wherein the step of providing the links comprises the step of: arranging an order of the links for viewing on the display based on a structure of the Web page (i.e. compare titles for links extracted from webpage and displayed on constrained device in see Kanevsky, col. 10, lines 35-50; see similar extraction and presentation in Figure 1 et seq. of Lincke).

Regarding dependent claim 24, Lincke in combination with Kanesky teaches the method of claim 16, wherein the mobile device consists of one or more of the following: an Internet phone; a personal digital assistant; and a two-way pager (i.e. col. 2 line 55 et seq. of Lincke: "cellular phones, pager systems").

Regarding dependent claim 25, Lincke in combination with Kanesky teaches the method of claim 16, wherein the links are categorized as first links, the method further comprising the steps of: accessing a second Web page data file identified by a second URL, wherein the Web page contains both content and links; extracting the links from the content of the second Web

page to provide second links; and providing the second links with the first links for viewing on the display (see Kanevsky, col. 10, lines 35-50; see similar extraction and presentation in Figure 1 et seq. of Lincke).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 16-25 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peng Ke whose telephone number is (571)272-4062. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th and Alternate Fridays 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David A. Wiley can be reached on (571) 272-3923. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Peng Ke

/Peng Ke/
Examiner, Art Unit 2174